

CONFIDENTIAL

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

9/4/91

Dear Harry,

When I opened the package you mailed yesterday and found about a half-dozen sheafs of what appear to be chapters, I presume in the new book you told me about, on top were two scraps of paper attached to page 18 of what begins with page 10. You marked what you'd written about Frameup and had this note on one of the scraps: "Harold: Is this info correct? Raise the price, as my ads have sold a lot of bks & mags and \$12.95 is too cheap."

I appreciate the good motive behind this order but on principle we have not raised the price on any of what would ordinarily be regarded as out-of-print books. We sell the xerox reprint of Whitewash for about a third of what publishers would.

The other note, with "Harold" in letters an inch or more high, reads, "I've got to have MDW file soon. Thanks, H."

As I told you, neither of us is up to doing the xeroxing here and on my machine the actual cost is about 25¢ a page. I told you that the place I have xeroxing done in town had just been sold and that when the new owners took over I'd drive in and get it done for you. I've been checking and the last info I have is that the place is still closed. Now, if you had done what I suggested you do months ago, ask Rick what he did with it, you'd have had these copies months ago, before we both developed ambulatory pain and difficulty. When you did not do that David brought Rick to lunch with us when I was at Hopkins a couple of weeks ago, Rick drew a sketch of where he'd misfiled it, not intending misfiling, and then when David was here, I not trusting myself on the stairs with the sprained foot and swollen ankle, David went there and retrieved the file.

You could not speak to Rick? I noticed in thumbing through these chapters that you refer to him in the first lie<sup>h</sup> of your Boswell chapter as "my chief investigator." You could not speak to your own "chief investigator?"

So now you order me, you've "got" to have it? Who do you think you are? and where do you get off making any demands on me, particularly when you now I've so many limitations and ailments - as it happens more than you know!

Over your bad behavior in the past I've told you several times I did not want to hear from you again. However, this time I will not relent. I do not want to hear from you again. Maybe I'll make the copies of the MDW file when I can, maybe I won't. I just will not accept this kind of bad behavior and these imperial demands. And if you think the \$500 you gave me, without my asking for anything, ever, includes anything you may decide your royal highness has a whim to be indulged over, you are silly. The enormous amount of time I've taken for you makes this a pittance. *I have tried to help you, as you know.*

I was curious about your writing anything about the King assassination because you

*KMR*  
 nothing at all about it. So I turned back to the first of those pages, 10. I suppose you begin with the end of what precedes and that it is on the R&K assassination. About which you also write from the depths of ignorance. I suppose the book you refer to, with the preceding pages missing ~~I~~ can't know, is the Turner-Christian book. I read it and I can think of good reasons for the publisher to withdraw it.

Then you go on to make a fool if not an idiot of yourself. It got to be so silly, ignorant, ridiculous and irresponsible I stopped before finishing page 12. I used a highlighter but that seems to baffle you so I'll mention a few things. *Cyretta Scott* King was not "primarily" responsible for creation of the HSCA. Lower on this page you actually say, "It is absolutely clear to me after reviewing all the known evidence in the case that renegades in the FBI and perhaps local police set up the murder of King."

Whom the gods would destroy, Harry.... You are now so self-important that you lie and do not even realize it, that is the incredible part of this. What in the world do you know about ANY, leave alone "all" of what you call "the known evidence in the case"?

You don't know a damned thing, and then you proceed to flaunt this.

It is minor perhaps, except for responsible writing, that you refer to a court proceeding in Great Britain as what our government gave it. It gave nothing officially to that government. It made representations to a British court, through a British law firm, and in the form of sworn statements.

You then say that when Ray's lawyers "finally were able to obtain the fingerprint evidence which they told the British they had implicating Ray in the murder, this evidence turned out to be false. Since no witnesses were presented... there was no cross examination...." You add, gratuitously and from profound stupidity and ignorance, that the British "could demand Ray back." For what? Robbing a bank of \$200? And after agreeing to his extradition instead of prosecuting him first? *(and it wasn't "Ray's lawyers.")*

With the unerring instinct of the phony, and when you write from ignorance you are a phony, you picked the one area of the entire extradition that was factually correct and did have a live witness, George Bonebrake, FBI fingerprint expert. The only fingerprint evidence was Ray's on the rifle and Ray's in the FBI's files and neither was false!

With no source at all, no real source being available for it, you say that in the Memphis jail Ray had "at all times, two guards within five feet of him all the time." False! An entire cell block was set aside for Ray and he alone of prisoners was in it for as I recall eight months. He had free access to all the cells in that block and he roamed around, exercised by walking on his hands, etc. The guards, who were sometimes more than two, had a table that was not within 5 feet of him when he was in any of the cells or when he moved a round.

You say "Ray was broken down" and "pled guilty in fear of being electrocuted." All false. He never broke down and he had no fear of being electrocuted. He finally decided

for reasons that are clear in the hearing transcripts that you are entirely ignorant of despite claim to having mastered all the "evidence" in the case, that yielding to Foreman's pressure was the only way he could get rid of him. If the judge had not died it would have worked. The trial judge had told Ray he would not permit him to get new counsel.

"Ray says he did not ~~really~~ know what the conspirators really planned to do." About what? In context, the assassination. He never said any such thing.

I'm not going into all that ~~his~~ so very wrong about your use of the "tramp" pictures, beginning with what is so very wrong about calling them tramps, but they did not come from "behind the grassy knoll" and it was not "just after" JFK was assassinated.

and it is I who brought to light the fact that the sketch you refer to had to have been made from the pictures you refer to, not that doing this was any big deal. But unlike those you cite as experts I did not stop there. I have a full account of where that sketch was made, even pictures of ~~their~~ being forwarded to the FBI, and you are full of shit. You say of this man "we call him 'Frenchy'..." when in fact Dick Sprague made up that "identification" that is not true in any aspect.

He is not "the same 'Jack Armstrong' mentioned above by Wayne Chastain..." If it is in the pages you sent me and in this chapter I missed it. (Thank God!) The man Wayne refers to as "Jack Armstrong" was in fact a real person, Jack Youngblood. Wayne <sup>h</sup> went off the deep end in this, alas. Fine person, good reporter. Because there is no resemblance to Youngblood, perhaps you meant the also irrelevant man Wayne referred to as the "eggs and bacon man." <sup>savage</sup> <sup>at</sup> Whose Wayne imagined what wasn't so. That was a college student who just happened to be at Jowers' bar to eat.

Hemming, Sprague, Penn Jones and the others you cite disgrace you and again flaunt your ignorance. The stuff about him <sup>(Frenchy)</sup> being close to Hall, Howard and Seymour isn't even good fiction. No connection at all, none reasonably even conjectured.

"Ray says that Raoul (and he spells it "Ruol") came out of the rooming house, dropped the bundle and they drove off, Raoul getting out after a few blocks. That is not what Ray "says," as you'd know if you read those transcripts, for he did testify and what you cite is what he wrote Huie when Huie was making demands in violation of their agreement. and Ray said what I say here under oath. Your command of "all" that "evidence" again, huh? *Spectacular!*

You've already said that Stephens was the only person who saw the man allegedly fleeing, and even he did not, so you say (12) "The sketch that witnesses drew of the small man who ran from the boarding house..." *No witnesses so no sketches.*

I noted in turning the page by accident that you begin a graf, "Ray has since not talked about his identification of 'Frenchy' as Roual, either." Since? He NEVER did!

With the exception of one on the Zapruder film the other chapters deal with your belief that the autopsy stuff was forged. I'd not have spent another minute on that in

in any event. But with this bit of what on a mere skimming - found in these two or two plus pages, I'd be foolish to spend another minute with such a crummy, ignorant, irresponsible, stupid, misleading manuscript and under no circumstances will I.

You made a great success of your "High Treason" under difficult circumstance and that appears to have given you an exalted opinion of yourself and that anything you write becomes true and factual as soon as you dream it up. In these few pages you did dream it. It is not real in any sense and when you cite sources they are not in any degree solid sources, no matter how well intended they were. As some were not, like Hemming.

I do not expect you to like this and probably you won't believe it, but unless I made a mistake by accident, and I'm certainly not going to waste more time in any checking of this rotten drivvel, I hope you'll benefit from it.

I've taken this time only so that you might. I could have ignored you, as you know. Or said nothing.

I have no idea where you are going but when you refer to the King assassination and that of RFK along with JFK's it seems probable that you are going to say the same assassins did all those jobs. I won't even argue that with you but it isn't so. That they resulted in what could be said to serve the same interests does not mean that one sinister gang was behind them all. Conspiracy is quite saleable and you can make some money from being Oliver Stone in print, but what kind of person would you be to spin off on trusting readers a theory that is without proof?

IF you have to do it, do it in a novel and don't make a disgrace of yourself in history, Harry.

One of my new medical problems is with my better eye, the one from which the cataract was removed. I do not see as well with it by far and sometimes very poorly. So I may have made more mistakes in typing and miss much in reading and correcting. But if I do, believe me this time, Harry, I'm not spending any more time with you or on this. Too much is, of course, too much.

With hope that you'll get your feet on the ground,

Herold